



FINAL MEETING SUMMARY GENERAL PLAN REVIEW COMMITTEE

Thursday, December 4, 2014

11:30 AM – 1:30 PM

Meeting Hosted By: Darcie White, Clarion Associates

General Plan Review Committee Members Present:

- Jim Liesen
- Dean Barlow
- Dorothy McMaster
- Mark Talley
- Dan Keyes
- Don Bergen
- Donna Best-Carolton
- Mike Eigenbrodt
- Doug Traub
- Donna Brister

General Plan Review Committee Members Absent:

- Nello Ruscitti
- Laura Smith
- Dick Gilbert
- Gerald Henkels

Staff Present:

- Stuart Schmeling, Senior Planner
- Diane Libby, Management Specialist

Darcie White of Clarion Associates welcomed the Committee to their third meeting. Darcie stated that the primary purpose of today's meeting is to continue the discussion from October, where the initial sections of the General Plan draft were reviewed. We now have a complete draft of the General Plan, but today's focus will be on the four new chapters.

Growth Management

Darcie stated that this section is fundamental to the 2002 plan, there are not a lot of changes here but we have separated it from the land use discussion because this is a precursor to getting into the land use plan, how are we incurring growth, how are we managing water, etc. There is some new verbiage regarding solar and other types of renewable energy.

Committee summarized comments/concerns (not limited to):

- Regarding public land leases, advocate for reduction in State ownership and land leases (specifically the island area) and offer fee simple ownership to encourage future development.
- Positive feedback provided regarding solar energy component.
- Positive feedback provided regarding topics of night skies and steep slopes as written.

Darcie clarified that what was she was hearing is that the City should be proactively pursuing a long term strategy for ownership transition on the Island.

Land Use Goals & Policies

Darcie stated this is one of the sections that has been expanded and changed the most. There has been a lot of work done in the City since the last General Plan was adopted in 2002. Darcie's comments are summarized to include the following:

- Reinforcing different character areas of the communities.
- Housing & Neighborhoods used to be in the Land Use chapter but now has its own chapter.
- Proactively pursue collaborative planning opportunities.
- Identifying new uses such as ASU and the campus area.

Committee summarized comments/concerns (not limited to):

- Page 22, contained the following public comment "additional compatibility issues between rural development and new development relating to animal and equestrian uses in some portions of the planning area of neighborhoods remain a challenge". The Committee felt this is not an issue.
- Discussion regarding interpretation of the use of the term "retirement community" and the Committee requests to remove that phrase unless used in the general sense such as "this is a great place to retire".

Land Use Map

Darcie began her responses by presenting and detailing the draft land use map changes. She stated that fundamentally the map isn't dramatically different. Darcie's comments are summarized and included the following:

- Proposed use changes to two areas on McCulloch from Mixed Use Commercial Nodal to Neighborhood Commercial Center.
- Proposed use change to the area West of Sara Park on Highway 95 from Mixed Use Commercial Nodal to Mixed Use Commercial.
- Question to Committee regarding two half circles at entrance to Sara Park for future possible highway bypass intersection, currently on land use map. Should this be removed from the proposed Land Use map or left as is for future discussion?
- Proposed changes of use just south of the airport to employment.
- Proposed correction of public lands and schools, shown incorrectly on current map.

Committee summarized comments/concerns related to the map (not limited to):

- Comments both pro and con made regarding the residential use component around the Sara Park master plan area. Some members said it should be limited, other members said they did not want limited uses in that area.
- Comments made stating there is no money for the bypass. It would be extremely expensive to go through the mountains. Unlikely to happen at all.
- Questions were raised regarding a process to be put in place that would allow the City to change areas to a higher use from a low or inappropriate use.
- Request was made for clarification of use of the term “multimodel”.
- Committee members responded to Darcie’s question regarding the two half circles at the Sara Park entrance. The Committee preferred to leave it as it is currently.
- Questions regarding areas of infill inside our city limits that are pre-planned, all low density residential of one unit per acre or less. Is there a provision that would allow that to go to a higher number such as up to 3 to 5 units per acre and not be restrictive?

Darcie responded with clarification for use of the term multimodel. Multimodel means that it accommodates car, bikes, pedestrians, so that if you have one commercial property built right next to another commercial property you should be able to get from one parking lot to the next without having to go out on the roadway. Darcie suggested the draft language term “multimodel” be changed to “connectivity” to clarify and eliminate confusion.

Darcie responded to the questions regarding change of use process. She stated there has been a lot of discussion regarding infill and revitalization. Darcie referred the group to Page 33 of the Land Use section which has the land use classifications. One example would be in the resort classification while there is recognition that there are feasibility issues such as ownership, etc., the concept of what could be there is reflected in the land use categories.

Economy

Darcie stated this is a new element in the plan. It acknowledges the different organizations involved in this topic. She clarified that the Partnership for Economic Development is very much alive and well and we misstated that, and we will take care of that. Several themes have become apparent throughout the discussions:

- On-going diversification of the employment base
- Tourism
- Quality of life
- Lake Havasu Regional Center - (the City functions as the shopping hub, recreational hub, health care hub, etc.)

Committee summarized comments/concerns related to the map (not limited to):

- One comment that diversifying the economy seems unrealistic and impractical.
- A significant part of our population do not like to see change, they want the City to stay exactly the way it was when they got here.
- Multiple comments that we do need to diversify the economic base, by providing jobs that will keep the ASU and MCC graduates here in our area.
- Concern that many companies are not aware of Lake Havasu City and what we have to offer them to bring their business here.

- Encourage employers to look at the freight savings if they shipped product to the Kingman rail yard and then trucked it here. It would be cheaper than trucking product all the way from the east coast.
- Encourage development of larger commercial buildings so that when we are approached we could have a new business up and running in a much shorter time frame.
- Concern that the low minimum wage is what harms the City in trying to keep recent graduates here.

Implementation Program

Darcie stated that if you are looking for a place to go in terms of what are some of the things we are focusing on in the General Plan, you don't have it in the current plan. The goal of this section is that this will be the most living part of this document. This is something that the City can come back to. It is a way to help structure what needs be done and general time frames for things to help implement the General Plan. This is meant to be the umbrella document, are we working together in all the other arenas to accomplish our goals. Darcie's comments are summarized as follows:

- Detailed explanation of the Action Plan Matrix in priorities and actions.
- Questions for the group regarding agreement/disagreement with the list.
- There is a place holder for a Summary of Priority Initiatives that should reflect the top 5 or 10 items from the list that should be elevated to a real focus over the next year or two.

Committee summarized comments/concerns related to the map (not limited to):

- Discussion that resulted in comments both pro/con regarding the subject of wayfinding.
- Regarding the projected growth in population, comments were made to determine who we want that target population to be in 10-20 years, and gear the economic growth in that direction.

In closing, Darcie stated that we now have a complete draft of the General Plan available online. We will make a few updates based on these meetings and we will repost it next week. We also have an online survey available so anyone can get on and review the draft and provide comments. We will leave that open comment period until the first week of January, following which you will get another revised draft.

In terms of meeting with this group what we are proposing is one more meeting with this group in the February to March timeframe, which we will confirm as quickly as we can, but it will be a joint public hearing with the Planning & Zoning Commission. We actually need to do two public hearings so we will do one in the evening and one in the morning. We would like to have as many folks from the committee as possible to talk with the Commission and share your feedback as we go forward. From that point, assuming the document gets through the Planning & Zoning Commission hearings, it would go to Council sometime in April and if it gets through Council, it will then be awhile before the election happens. There is no firm date set for the election, but I believe it is going to be late 2015.

Right now is the critical period as we are trying to get as much feedback as possible. Our public turnout has been lighter than we would like to see so we could use your help in rounding people up and getting them to pay attention to this very important process.

Meeting concluded at 1:35 p.m.